

JUL 12 1944

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH.

# CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 37, NO. 21

May 1, 1944

WHOLE NO. 997

## REVIEWS

MCGEACHY, Quintus Aurelius Symmachus and the Senatorial Aristocracy of the West (*Quasten*); ARBESMANN, HUMPFNER, Jordani de Saxonia Ordinis Eremitarum S. Augustini Liber Vitasfratrum (*Foster*); MICHELL, Economics of Ancient Greece (*Day*); JACOBY, Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker (*Bloch*)

## ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES



## FIFTEEN GREEK PLAYS

*Translated into English by*

**Gilbert Murray, Benjamin Bickley Rogers, and others**

**With an Introduction and a Supplement from the 'Poetics' of Aristotle by**

**Lane Cooper**

793 pages

College edition \$3.00

Already adopted at: Goucher, Rockford, Northwestern, Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, University of California at Berkeley, Pennsylvania State College, Fieldston School, University of Louisville, University of Denver, Duke, Cornell, Vassar, Wesleyan University, Boston University, Tufts, Gustavus Adolphus, Mt. Holyoke, Smith, Bernard School for Girls, Yale, Cedar Crest College, Wooster, Nazareth College, St. Joseph's College, Skidmore, Carleton, Houghton, University of Iowa, and others.

Write for an examination copy

**OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS**

**NEW YORK, Inc.**

**114 FIFTH AVENUE**

**NEW YORK 11, NEW YORK**

# CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Published weekly (each Monday) except in weeks in which there is an academic vacation or Armistice Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Easter, or Memorial Day. A volume contains approximately twenty-five issues.

Owner and Publisher: The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of Publication: University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Printed by The Beaver Printing Company, Greenville, Pennsylvania.

James Stinchcomb, Editor, University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Franklin B. Krauss, Secretary and Treasurer, Pennsylvania State College; Box 339, State College, Penna.

Contributing Editors: Lionel Casson, Jotham Johnson, Eugene W. Miller, Charles T. Murphy, J. C. Plumpe, Bluma L. Trell.

Price, \$2.00 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$2.50. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers: to subscribers 15 cents, to others 25 cents prepaid (otherwise 25 cents and 35 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, sixty cents must be added to the subscription price. For residents of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, or the District of Columbia, a subscription to CLASSICAL WEEKLY (or, alternatively, to The Classical Journal) is included in the membership fee of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, whose members are also entitled to The Classical Outlook and The Classical Journal at special prices in combinations available from the Secretary-Treasurer.

Entered as second-class matter October 14, 1938, at the post office at Pittsburgh, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, authorized October 14, 1938.

Volume 37 contains issues dated: October 4, 11, 18, 25; November 1, 15, 29; December 6, 13 (1943); January 3, 10, 17; February 7, 14; March 6, 13, 20, 27; April 17, 24; May 1, 8, 15, 22; June 5 (1944).

When the National Education Association is meeting in Pittsburgh early in July, members of the classical organizations will be made welcome at a luncheon of the Classical Association of Pittsburgh and Vicinity. It will be held at the Ruskin Hotel July 6. Reservations will be made by Miss Laura G. Pound, Box 34, Duquesne, Pennsylvania.

Sometimes parents of a ninth-grade pupil ask whether I think their young one should study Latin in high school. I can always call to their attention one fact that appeals to them. In Latin classes the pupil will be associated with only the best minds among the budding intellects around him and with a teacher of strong intellectual and aesthetic inclinations. I have often thought, when listening to an analysis of the reasons for studying Latin, that here at least the real reason is so simple that analysis is impossible. It is merely that the taking of Latin insures contact with a teacher who has both a wide literary experience and a special training in a demanding discipline.

These Latin teachers are intellectually superior to teachers of other subjects here or elsewhere; they exercise thinking abilities every day which can lie dormant for weeks on end in a less rigorous field. Of their excellent backgrounds and social training I can speak even more assuredly. They are trusted in the schools, or they would not always be hurrying to meetings of the committees to which they are appointed, or busy with the reports and special studies entrusted to them and with the multifarious array of extracurricular responsibilities which none of my friends in the schools carry except Latin teachers. But my clearest view of these Latin teachers sees their professional growth; they have more professional literature and meetings than most teachers; they have closer contact with their colleagues in other cities; they are active in organizations that demand scholarship and open minds. It amazes me too to find out how well they know their pupils and the home environment from which each comes. They are always active in community and church enterprises.

Year after year I see those students succeed in college who studied Latin in high school. Someone measures their success and says it comes because of the study of Latin; another after a similar measuring decides that success came in spite of Latin. I know only one thing about it. The student whose mind has been tested by the disciplines of Latin knows whether he has an intellect to educate.

The teachers of Latin are industrious. They have to be, to do the many things required of them by the fact that they have good pupils. No one aware of the many facets of the pupil's experience touched by the process of learning and reading Latin can doubt the demands made on the teacher. Here is a teacher who cannot hurry over a disturbing detail with a brief flippancy about differences of opinion; he is dealing with the phenomena of linguistics and the still more abstruse factor of meanings. Honesty of intellect alone can answer the questions raised in Latin classes. No body of shifting opinion and sentiment invites aimless discussion. You do not determine the function of an infinitive by a show of hands or what the schoolboys delight to call a "gallop poll." Only the strict records of documentary literature claim attention—words, rules, etymologies, interlaced details of history and social relationships so old that one has to apply dispassionate thought to understand them, ideas comprehended in a classical foreign medium for new expression in the vernacular, and the machinery of human diction which master craftsmen found useful and men of all centuries built into the fabric of Christian civilization.

Those who teach Latin wisely stress word histories as a useful by-product of their work. Vocabulary is increased and deepened in English as systematically as in Latin. This, as every teacher knows, is the most strenuous of all the teaching arts because it skirts the danger of inconclusive and inaccurate thinking. Now that inaccuracy and inconclusiveness can be seen in their true colors as unpatriotic and antisocial, we can be more than ever grateful that the intellectual leaders of our coming generation are being daily drilled in straight thinking by trained disciplinarians of deep and wide experience.

# REVIEWS

**Quintus Aurelius Symmachus and the Senatorial Aristocracy of the West.** By JOHN ALEXANDER MCGEACHY, JR. iii, 203 pages. University of Chicago Libraries, Chicago 1942 (Dissertation) \$2

The author of this dissertation is fully conscious of the fact that the works of Symmachus contain singularly little of real value and that his correspondence is full of high-sounding phrases but empty of real content. Nevertheless Symmachus' epistles throw some light on the position of the aristocracy in the society of the Empire. For this reason the author undertakes to study Symmachus as a representative of the nobility of the Late Roman Empire, although it is a search for small grains of wheat among large quantities of chaff.

After an introductory chapter on "Symmachus and His Works" he deals with the aristocracy and the imperial government (Ch. II), the aristocracy in the economic life of the Empire (Ch. III), the social life of the aristocracy (Ch. IV), the aristocracy and the religious struggle (Ch. V) and finally the literary and intellectual interests of the aristocracy. It is a gloomy picture which we gain from this survey. In the field of politics the great nobles claimed as their right the most important positions in the bureaucracy, yet at the same time they showed no willingness to sacrifice any of their personal economic power so that the central government might be strengthened. They boasted of eternal Rome but they neglected to serve her with true loyalty. As far as their economic interests were concerned these senatorial aristocrats were a class of parasites. In an age when the level of economic life was declining and agriculture in the Roman Empire was decaying they amassed huge fortunes by extending their control over ever larger areas. Their land-hunger could not be appeased. If they could not increase their estates by legitimate methods, they used outright force and legal trickery to gain their ends. The forms of social activity of the senatorial aristocrats were hollow. In their private social life they recognized no higher class. They followed an elaborate social code which had no place for recognition of inferiors.

Even in their attitude toward religion their self-interest was evident. Symmachus and his circle could not give up the state-supported religion of Rome without acknowledging that one more excuse for the continued dominance of the senatorial aristocracy had been removed. It is only in the field of intellectual and literary interests that an observer may see in the aristocracy true devotion to an ideal. Their interest in classical literature was genuine. Although their knowledge of antiquity and classical history was rather superficial, although their poetry was prosaic and they judged a philosopher by the clothes he wore, their interest in the correction and publication of texts made

possible the transmission of many Latin authors to modern times. But this most valuable contribution to the intellectual life of succeeding ages hardly suffices to forgive their serene disregard of the crisis through which the Empire was passing, their inability to see that their own selfish economic gain meant the undermining of the very system which made possible the existence of their class.

The author of this dissertation reveals a good knowledge of sources. It is however regrettable that in quoting his sources he never gives an indication of the editions which he is using nor any original text. The reader therefore has no possibility of examining the correctness of his translation.

In Chapter V occur a few statements which are untenable from an historical point of view. Thus we read (129): By the end of the fourth century Christianity and paganism were not two distinct and separate philosophies of life.

The old and the new religion were certainly two distinct philosophies of life. The abrenuntiatio which preceded baptism, the canons of the synods and the treatises of writers of the fourth century speak against such a statement. It is an entirely different question whether the mentality of the adherents of the new faith was always very different from that of their pagan neighbours. Here the sermons of the fourth-century preachers indicate clearly that it was difficult for many Christians to forget their pagan customs.

Similarly I doubt that the struggle between the Roman State and the Christian Church can be called a "calm conflict of control which went on in the western provinces" (130) and that there were only "exceptional disturbances in the generally calm development of the religious conflict in the West" (ibid.). The numerous martyrdoms of Gaul, Rome and Africa are well known and it is typical that the aphorism 'Semen est sanguis Christianorum' originated with a Westerner.

JOHANNES QUASTEN

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

**Jordani de Saxonia Ordinis Eremitarum S. Augustini Liber Vitasfratrum.** Ad fidem codicum recensuerunt, prolegomenis, apparatu critico, notis instruxerunt RUDOLPHUS ARBESMANN et WINFRIDUS HÜMPFNER. xciv, 548 pages. Cosmopolitan Science and Art Service Co., New York 1943 \$8.50 (paperbound \$7.50)

Seldom has such a promising series as the Studies in St. Augustine and the Augustinian Order had such an unpromising beginning as this edition of the Liber Vitasfratrum of Jordan of Saxony. It is a mixture of good, bad, and indifferent workmanship. According to the preface, "W. Hümpfner is responsible for the Introduction, for the tracing of the manuscripts and for the historical notes; R. Arbesmann for the collection of the



manuscripts, the elaboration of the critical apparatus and the source material used by Jordanus. For the final revision of the text both are equally responsible."

The text is the most satisfactory part of the book. (It is, of course, impossible to make any statement regarding its accuracy without the manuscripts.) There is a wide selection of variant readings at the foot of each page, and the discussion of the relationship of the manuscripts in the Introduction makes it possible for a discriminating reader to evaluate the variant readings which appeal to him. Unfortunately the method of presenting the variant readings was not carefully worked out; sometimes the reading of the text is placed before the variant, sometimes it is not. For example, on page 421 the text reads "exempla" and the variant "exempula"; in the following line, however, the text reads "audens" and the variant "audens] audiens." The mixing of two different systems—without rhyme or reason—only confuses the reader, until he discovers that it has no particular significance.

The Introduction, which by all rights should be the most scholarly part of the book, is a poor performance indeed. In only one section—the part which deals with Jordan's personality—does the writer give a sign of what might well be called "graceful scholarship"; for the rest, it is facts, facts, facts. One need read only a few pages written by the great Benedictine scholar, Cardinal Gasquet, to discover the difference between mastering facts and being mastered by facts. The Introduction is filled with facts which might better have been placed in the footnotes, and the footnotes in turn are filled with facts which might better have been omitted altogether. The mere overabundance of facts, however, is not as bad as the lack of organization which pervades them. Thus, if the reader desires a description of the Liber Vitasfratrum, he must look in half a dozen different places in the Introduction, and even then he may not be entirely satisfied. When one turns to the section dealing with the significance of the book, what does he find? A careful discussion? No. Instead, after a few cursory remarks on its significance, the reader comes across a five-page discussion of the Rule of St. Augustine (not unmixed with advertising for a forthcoming edition of the Rule which the editors have prepared). This is material which plainly deserved more extensive and pertinent treatment in a section by itself, in view of the fact that Jordan had a great deal to say about the Rule in his book. A bit puzzled, the reader proceeds, only to discover that the next seven pages are devoted to a refutation of those who have questioned the continuity of the Augustinian order. And how is this digression justified? Merely by Jordan's brief statement to the effect that he did not feel himself qualified to write on the subject.

The book as a whole provides abundant evidence of careless and incompetent workmanship. Take, for instance, such an elementary thing as spelling. The errata

sheet gives the reader the impression that the editors have carefully sought out and corrected all of their errors, but this is far from being the case. On page xxvii we learn of Gouville [*sic*] and Caius College, while on page lx we discover the Museum Plautin [*sic*]—Moretus. Rosweyduus, which appears twice on page xlvii, yields the variant form Rosweydius on the same page, while Flensburg, which appears twice on page xli, is indexed as Flenzburg. As for common nouns—well, just get out your blue pencil! You may even find two misspelled words in one line; witness *codex*, twice spelled *code* in one line (lix). The editors have not been much more fortunate in quoting their own text. Quotations from the Liber Vitasfratrum in the Introduction differ from the same passages as they appear in the text. To take only one example, a quotation on page xix of the Introduction reads:

Cum nuper in anno jubileo perstrepenste pestilentia per mundum, fratres passim festinarent currere Romam, quod si permissum fuisset, conventus nonnulli quasi vacui fratribus mansissent . . .

The same passage, however, on page 223 of the text reads:

Cum enim nuper in anno jubileo, perstrepenste pestilentia per mundum, fratres passim festinarent currere Romam, quod si permissum fuisset, conventus nonnulli quasi vacui a fratribus remansissent . . .

Not only are there three variant readings in this one passage, but not one of them is listed in the variant readings at the foot of page 223. This is by no means a complete account of the different kinds of careless workmanship to be found in the book.

The planning of the series as a whole shows the same lack of care and forethought which is exhibited by the first volume. To begin with, Latin and English are employed indiscriminately in the critical material. (More than once, indeed, they are mixed together in the same sentence! Take the following example (lix): "Fivizzani found the MS in Conventu S. Augustini Balneoregii . . .") In view of the international character of the series, which is plainly indicated by the Latin title-page, this is an unfortunate procedure. The critical material should have been presented consistently either in English, the language of the editors, or in Latin, the language of the Church. The mixture of the two, as it now stands, is hard to justify on any rational ground. Furthermore, too little attention has been paid to consistency in matters of editorial procedure. This is particularly true of the treatment of proper nouns. We find, for example, Johannes de Lana on page xi and John of Lana on page xii, not to mention Joannes de Lana on page lxiii. Nor is this lack of consistency confined to small matters. The pages containing the Liber Vitasfratrum are arranged with the text at the top, the variants next, and the sources at the foot of the page;

the pages containing the Rule of St. Augustine, however, are arranged with the text at the top, the sources next, and the variants at the foot of the page. If further proof of the lack of careful and intelligent supervision of the series is required, the reader will find abundant evidence of it in the superficial notes, incomplete bibliography, and hopelessly inadequate index which have been tacked on at the end of the volume. *Finis coronat opus.*

JOSEPH ARNOLD FOSTER

MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE

**The Economics of Ancient Greece.** By H. MICHELL. xii, 415 pages. University Press, Cambridge; Macmillan, New York 1940 \$4

It is always a wholesome thing for work in one special field to be appraised by a scholar in another, but related, field—provided only that that scholar is competent and possessed of a sympathetic viewpoint. Fortunately for students of the economics of Greece, these qualifications are to be found in the person of Professor Michell, who is a professor of political economy at McMaster University. The pitfall most to be avoided by writers in this field is the temptation to read too much of the modern into the ancient. This pitfall Professor Michell has successfully avoided. Moreover, he has recognized, quite correctly, that, owing to the paucity of evidence which is the constant plague of the historian of economic matters in ancient times, many of our conclusions "can only be intelligent guesses" (i; cf. ix).

Professor Michell has undertaken to treat the subject of Greek economics during the centuries preceding the conquests of Alexander. Inasmuch as this is a tremendous field, replete with difficulties and encumbered with an enormous literature, it is only fair to insist that the reader bear in mind the specific purpose for which the book was written. In his Preface (ix) Professor Michell writes: "I have endeavoured in the following chapters to give, in short compass, the results of modern research, and the conclusions of scholars working in this fascinating field." This is a very modest statement, for, actually, Professor Michell has done more than merely repeat the statements of other writers. Here and there, throughout the book, he has offered valuable criticisms—as, for example, in his analysis (332-3) of Hasebroek's statements on monetary problems. The literature consulted by the author was wide-ranging and, in general, adequate to his purpose.<sup>1</sup>

The wealth of content of the book may best be shown by setting down the chapter headings and the

various subtitles. I. The Background of Greek Economics (1-37). II. Agriculture (38-88). III. Mining and Minerals (89-124). IV. Labour (125-68). V. Industry (169-209). VI. Commerce (I) (210-57). VII. Commerce (II) (258-83): The Grain Trade; The Timber Trade. VIII. Trade in Various Products. Greeks and Phoenicians. Piracy (284-310). IX. Money and Banking (311-51). X. Public Finance (352-93).

The importance of the study of Greek economics is too often overlooked, and Professor Michell does well to insist that "... if we are to understand the Greeks we must know them in all the various aspects of their lives..." (10). Equally important is the fact that, while many of their ideas and practises were, as compared with our own, quite undeveloped, in many respects there is much of value for our present-day world to be gained from the study of the economic thought and practises of the Greeks. Many of their problems were closely akin to ours (cf. 328). In this connection it is most interesting to observe the number of modern notes in Greek life which appear in Professor Michell's book. A number of them may be set down here, at random: "the international arms trade," "blocked exchange," convoys, policing of the seas, combinations in restraint of trade, price-controls, "cornering" of the market, "international trade," settlement of international balances by payments in gold, "Gresham's Law" (which functioned also in the ancient world), debasement of coinage (equals "managed" currency; resorted to, at times, to bring about redistribution of wealth), the dole, "unfavorable" balance of trade, collusion in bidding for public contracts, payments to disabled veterans and to orphans of citizens killed in combat, the "means test," sickness, accident, and old-age pensions, the capital levy, "possibly a sales tax," and totalitarianism. This latter, we should remember, may be traced back from the twentieth century to the doctrines of the Greek political philosophers (26). It may also be noted that in Greece state control of the finances of private individuals generally exceeded that of modern times (377).

Classicists would, in view of their propensity, at times, to idealize the Greeks in all respects, do well to bear in mind Professor Michell's observation that, while the Greek was undoubtedly a fine artist, our work in modern times is technically better. But we may also observe that this superiority is attributable to our possession of highly developed technical processes and machinery, the lack of which, in the instance of the Greeks, may be ascribed to limited capital and the employment of slave labor (169-70).

It is Professor Michell's main thesis that the decline of Athens was brought about by its unsound financial system. "We must come to the conclusion, which seems inescapable, that the whole political and economic system was essentially and irremediably unsound and

<sup>1</sup>Better citations might have been given on some occasions, as on page 174, where Professor Michell refers to the failure to find baked bricks among the remains of the Philippeum at Olympia and cites Bluemner's *Technologie*, ii, 11, n. 4 (along with Pausanias) rather than the official Olympia publications.

wrought its own destruction" (17). "The whole theory and practice of public finance was unsound . . ." (393), and then Professor Michell goes on to agree with Andreades' conclusion that the "destruction" of Athens was brought about by its financial system. This is almost certainly an undue simplification. It was, rather, a combination of factors—prominent among which were unsound financial policies, shifting of trade routes, loss of empire, the founding of new commercial centers after the conquests of Alexander, and the exhaustion induced by numerous wars that occasioned the downfall of the city. However, in fairness to Professor Michell, one must observe that elsewhere in his book he has stated very clearly the various bases upon which Athenian commercial dominance rested and the causes—at least, most of them—which led to the disappearance of this dominance. On pages 252-4 five causes of Athenian commercial primacy are given: (1) the excellent location of Athens and its fine harbor facilities; (2) Athenian control of the seas; (3) regulation, by Athens, of the commerce of its empire; (4) the establishment of excellent banking facilities at Athens; and (5) the maintenance of efficient courts to handle litigation in commercial matters. Professor Michell rightly calls attention (252) to the fact that Athenian commerce was " . . . almost unrivalled until, with the rise of Alexandria, the whole picture of Mediterranean commerce was changed." On page 254 he writes: "It was when the financial centre of the Eastern Mediterranean left Athens and the bankers of Alexandria, Delos, and Rhodes took the business away from the Athenians that the final eclipse of the city came." And, again on page 254: Athens "was finally ruined by the rise of Alexandria, the rivalry of Corinth, Rhodes and Delos, and the dynastic struggles of Alexander's successors." It is well, also, to remember that the prosperity of Athens at the end of the fourth century, at the time of Demetrius of Phalerum, was still almost as great as at any other time in its history, that the city enjoyed a remarkable renaissance in the second century B.C., and that in the succeeding century this prosperity came to an end contemporaneously with the sack of the city by Sulla and the virtual exhaustion of the silver mines at Laurium. The revenues derived from these mines contributed no inconsiderable amount to the city's favorable circumstances.

To return to the question of the soundness of Athenian public finance, the reader will detect in Professor Michell's discussion certain considerations which seem to require somewhat more cautious conclusions. First, he points to the fact (391) that the striking recuperation of Athens from the vicissitudes of the Peloponnesian War "argues not only a resilience of the national character but a practical ability in finance for which the Athenians have had too little credit paid them." Second, after making the statement that one of the two main bases upon which Athenian public finance rested

was taxation of the rich, Professor Michell seems to maintain that, at least in part because of the "ceaseless attempts of the people to mulct the rich of their wealth," the devices employed by the state in raising money were "almost invariably economically unsound" (353). However, on pages 391-3 he informs us that "there was a very imperfect diffusion of wealth;" that the capital levies (*eisphorae*) and the liturgies were, in effect, excess profit taxes, "which ought to have worked with reasonable fairness;" that, inasmuch as there were no death duties and inheritance taxes, no other means were available for exacting from the wealthy their fair share of the expenses of the state; and that the "indirect taxes must have borne heavily on the poor."

A number of minor lapses may be cited. The name Herodas is misspelled (173; and Index, 406). The statement is made that Greek wines are not exported in modern times (191). Commagene is placed in "South-west Cappadocia" (201). "Cyrenaic" vases were probably manufactured, in large part, at Sparta instead of at Cyrene (298). In note 3, page 319 the Greek of Herodotus (I, 60: ἐν τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Παιανίει ἦν γυνὴ τῇ οὐνομα ἦν Φύη, μέγαθος ἀπὸ τεσσέρων πηχέων ἀπολείπονσα τρεῖς δακτύλους καὶ ἄλλως εὐειδής) is interpreted as meaning " . . . a maiden named Phye, who was six feet tall, but lacked three fingers, . . ." The proper interpretation is, rather, that Phya was, for a Greek, very tall—six feet, lacking three δάκτυλοι (a δάκτυλος is a measure of about seven-tenths of an inch)—about five feet ten in height. On page 149 the following statement appears: " . . . the Bible has innumerable references to slaves, albeit the word is softened into 'servants' or the harsher word 'bondsmen'" with a note "The word 'slave' is only twice used, once in Jeremiah ii. 14, in the Old Testament, and once in the New, Rev. xviii. 13." But surely the word δοῦλος is used over and over again in the Bible. This seems to be an instance of faulty method: the original is to be preferred to even the best of translations. My colleague, Professor Gertrude M. Hirst, of Barnard College, has called it to my attention that the word "slave" appears only twice in the Authorized [i.e. King James] Version.

In editorial matters some question may be raised concerning the treatment of Greek words, which are merely transliterated, without Italics, and often with unjustifiable capitalization (e.g. 176-7).

Reviewers often bewail the failure of an author to extend the scope of his work to include various additional topics or to adopt additional methods of treatment of his subject. Thus, one might deplore the absence of more detailed treatment of Greek economic theory. Or, he might regret the failure to employ the historical method of treatment, which would restrict the tendency toward unwarranted deductions from combinations of data from widely separated periods—an important consideration in a work which ranges, as Professor Michell's does, from Homer to Alexander.



Such criticisms, it would seem to this reviewer, should not be pressed against Professor Michell's book, for an adequate treatment of the subject that followed these suggestions would require numerous preliminary studies and would result in a publication of considerably greater length than the book under review. Before the complete and authoritative work on the economic history of Greece from Homer to Alexander can be written, an immense amount of research is still necessary. In the meantime, such evaluations as Professor Michell's are, by no means, without value.

In conclusion, it may be said that Professor Michell's book is a very competent contribution, with valuable collections and analyses of a great amount of important material by a scholar in the field of economics, and that it will be of great assistance not only to students of ancient economics, but also to classicists in general. In our present-day world economic problems are of vital importance. Professor Michell has shown how the student of modern economics can learn much from the Greeks. If the Classics are to survive, we must have more books to show how vitally important the lessons are that we can learn from them.

JOHN DAY

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

### Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker.

By FELIX JACOBY. Dritter Teil: Geschichte von Staedten und Voelkern. A: Autoren ueber verschiedene Staedte (Laender). 9\*, 182 pages. Brill, Leiden 1940

This volume is a sad and at the same time consoling document of the course of scholarship in our time. Jacoby's collection of the fragments of the Greek historians has long been recognized as one of the most important undertakings in our field. In 1930 M. Rostovtzeff wrote referring to the first two parts already published, that "there is no historian of the ancient world who has not the book of Jacoby daily in his hands" (*Litteris* 7 [1930] 235). A few years later, when Jacoby was preparing the third part, further publication of his work in Germany became impossible. That the continuation could appear in the same form outside the borders of Germany, in spite of the steadily mounting difficulties, is an achievement, the credit for which is shared by author, publisher, and Oxford University. The readiness with which the publisher Brill took over the complicated task, and the care with which he executed it deserve the highest praise; they are worthy of the traditions of Lugdunum Batavorum, a name which, like that of Oxford, no philologist can mention without veneration.

To recapitulate: The first part, *Genealogie und Mythographie* (1923), contains the fragments of 63 historians, among them: Hekataios, Pherekydes, Hel-

lanikos, Herodotos, and Euhemeros; the second part, *Zeitgeschichte* (1926-30), deals with almost two hundred authors, among them: the Hellenika of Oxyrhynchos, Ephoros, Duris, Phylarchos, Nikolaos of Damaskos, Theopompos and the Alexander historians, the *Marmor Parium*, and Apollodoros.

The third part is devoted to local history, and this review deals with the first (A) of the three volumes which will comprise it. The second (B) will cover the historians of Greek cities and regions, the third (C) those of barbarian countries. The present first fascicle (A) gives the fragments of those ethnographers who wrote about various countries or cities, and who consequently could not be treated in the geographically organized volumes B and C. Fascicle A gives the fragments of 35 historians, the most outstanding of whom are Charon of Lampsakos (No. 262), Hekataios of Abdera (No. 264), Rhianos (No. 265), Nikandros (No. 271-2), Alexander Polyhistor (No. 273), King Juba (No. 275), and the authors quoted by Pseudo-Plutarch in the *Parallela Minora* and in *De fluviis* (No. 284-96). It is most fortunate that Jacoby has included the poets Rhianos and Nikandros who were lacking in K. and Th. Mueller's *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*. The commentary to this fascicle has been printed, but as far as my knowledge goes, not published. That it will be more copious than those on the first two parts will certainly meet with general approval. Each of the authors mentioned above presents problems which cannot be dealt with in a few lines.

While I do not wish to anticipate a discussion of the commentary which will be reviewed when it appears, it is possible and necessary to refer to two important investigations which Jacoby has published under separate covers in order to relieve his commentary. "Charon von Lampsakos" is the title of one of them (*Studi italiani di filologia classica* 15 [1939] 207-42). Jacoby has succeeded here both in bringing order to the list of Charon's works preserved by Suidas (*FGrHist* 262 T 1) and in settling definitely Charon's date: by demonstrating that three of his works, namely *Πρωταίεις οἱ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων* (a chronicle of the type of Hellanikos' *Ἱερεῖαι αἱ ἐν Ἀργεῖ*), *Kretika*, and *Libyka*, belong to the period of Sparta's hegemony in Greece, 405-395, in which latter year Lampsakos came again under Persian domination. This makes Charon a younger contemporary of Hellanikos rather than a precursor or contemporary of Herodotus as has previously been believed. Jacoby's convincing demonstration has superseded all earlier literature on the subject, L. Pearson's pertinent chapter in *Earlier Ionian Historians* (Oxford 1939, 139-51) not excluded.

Not less welcome is Jacoby's other contribution, "Die Ueberlieferung von Ps. Plutarchs *Parallela Minora* und die Schwindelautoren" (*Mnemosyne* ser. 3, 8, fasc. 2 [1940] 73-144). By a penetrating analysis of the text tradition of the *Parallela Minora* in the manuscripts as

well as in Stobaeus and Lydus, he proves beyond doubt that our present text is but an excerpt of an epitome of the original and that this epitome was copied more faithfully by Stobaeus whose version therefore becomes a primary source for constituting the text of the epitome. Jacoby's treatment of the quotations from otherwise unknown historians in the *Parallela* is a masterpiece of method and criticism which every philologist will enjoy reading. It takes the ground out from under the feet of those who, like Schlereth, Schmid, and Nachstaedt, have attempted to demonstrate these citations to be genuine (cf. the approving remarks of F. C. Babbitt, *Plutarch's Moralia IV* [Loeb] 1936, 254). That names like Agatharchides of Samos, Kallisthenes of Sybaris, Timagenes the Syrian, are invented after the famous historians Agatharchides of Knidos, Kallisthenes of Olynthos, and Timagenes of Alexandria should not have been doubted: the principle of invention, as Jacoby rightly emphasizes, is too obvious.

The text which Jacoby has offered in the present fascicle is excellent and in every respect vastly superior to that of Mueller. Compare, e.g., Charon, *FGH-Hist* 262 F 7 with the corresponding F 6, *FHG I*, 33, or Alexander Polyhistor 273 F 81 with F 1-2, *FHG III*, 210. The fragments of Hekataios of Abdera include the large sections of Diodorus' first book which are taken from *Περὶ Αἰγυπτιῶν* (264 F 25). New also are the fragments of Alexander Polyhistor's *Chaldaika* (?) preserved in the Armenian version of Eusebius' *Chronicle* (273 F 79-80).

The volumes III B and C will, more than any previous part of Jacoby's work, serve to justify his method of arrangement, so much disputed without due consideration of the fact that final judgment in this question is possible only after the whole collection is complete. To have all local historians together under the name of the city or country which they describe will be an extraordinary advantage over the Muellers' collection

where these authors are dispersed throughout all four volumes (with the exception of the most important historians of Athens in vol. I). In the new edition it will be possible, e.g., to read under the heading "Sicily" Hippys of Rhegion, Antiochus of Syracuse, Philistos of Syracuse, Timaios of Tauromenion, and many other authors of historical works on Sicily. Only on the basis of Jacoby's system of grouping the authors according to the literary *genos* which they represent, was it possible to assemble the local historians in the above described fashion, which no one can deny is the most practical. Although I do not wish to revive the discussion about the organization of Jacoby's collection, it seems to me a duty to state that the more I become acquainted with the parts of his work already published, the more I am compelled to admire also its organization.

Volume III B will contain among other authors Timaios, Philochoros, Memnon of Heraklea, Philon of Byblos; III C, Ktesias, Manetho, Megasthenes, Berosos. From the material offered by C. and Th. Mueller one gathers that part III will surpass part II in size and, above all, in the number of authors. It will give us a most impressive picture of Greek local historiography, comparable to a vast field of ruins in which no building is completely preserved. This picture will be supplemented by part IV which is dedicated to the philosophers and philologists among the historians: This part will presumably be dominated by Aristotle and his school.

There is so much that is interesting in the volumes which are yet to appear and, to judge from what Jacoby has already given us, there is such good reason for eager expectation, that the reviewer cannot forbear expressing his hope that he may soon be able to report about new volumes of the collection.

HERBERT BLOCH

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

#### ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

##### HISTORY

DOW, STERLING. *Two Families of Athenian Physicians*. Dieuches and Mnesitheos are representatives of two families in which fathers trained their sons in medicine, whether this custom was then formulated in the Hippocratic Oath or not until later. The two physicians often named by Galen, Pliny and others were grandsons of physicians who dedicated an Athenian relief (IG<sup>2</sup> 4359) now dated from stylistic and orthographic evidence about 360-40 B.C.  
*Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 12 (1942) 18-26

MAY, H. G. *The Ten Lost Tribes*. Anglo-Israelitism exposed in all its foolishness. *Inter alia*, the ten tribes of Israel as such were never exiled, but continued for the larger part in Palestine, those in the province of Samaria intermingling with new immigrants to form the Samaritans. The number of Israelites deported could not have been more than one-twentieth to one-fiftieth of the total population; the ten tribes were never "lost", because never deported. There is a great scarcity

of evidence to support Anglo-Israelite theories.

*Biblical Archaeologist* VI (1943) 55-60 (Upson)

MIEROW, CHARLES CHRISTOPHER. *Tiberius Himself*. Tacitus' unbiased and often reluctant praise of Tiberius reveals the Emperor "as a man possessed of many admirable traits and a ruler who prided himself on his open-mindedness, impartiality and tolerance."

*PhQ* 22 (1943) 289-307 (P. F. Jones)

MILNE, J. G. *The Chronology of Solon's Reforms*. τὴν τοῦ νομισματος αὐξήσιν in Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 10) does not mean 'increase in coinage' but 'increase in the unit of currency', and the reference is to the substitution of the tetradrachm for the didrachm. It was for the purpose of increasing Athenian trade in silver that Solon, after his trip to Egypt, made this change in the unit. Archaeological evidence confirms this assumption since the earliest Athenian tetradrachms must be dated about 570 B.C. rather than 593, the date of the legislation. The increase in weights and measures referred to in the passage was probably made at the same time and for the same purpose.

*CR* 57 (1943) 1-3

(F. P. Jones)